



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*[Handwritten initials]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/670,119	06/25/96	NG	SIM-001(7434)

HM12/0801

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR  
TESTA HURWITZ & THIBEAULT  
HIGH STREET TOWER  
125 HIGH STREET  
BOSTON MA 02110

EXAMINER

HAYES, R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 08/01/98

*23*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Notification of Non-Compliance with  
37 CFR 1.192(c)**

Application No.  
**08/670,119**

Applicant(s)  
**Ng et al**

Examiner  
**Robert C. Hayes**

Group Art Unit  
**1647**



The Appeal Brief filed on May 15, 2000 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

Applicant is given a TIME LIMIT of ONE MONTH from the date of this letter or any time remaining in the period under 37 CFR 1.192(a) for filing a new complete brief. If a new brief that fully complies with 37 CFR 1.192(c) is not timely submitted, the appeal will be dismissed. The new complete brief must be filed IN TRIPLICATE. See 37 CFR 1.192(a).

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6. ☒ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
  - a. ☐ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
  - b. ☒ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
  - a) *The status of each individual amendment to the claims, etc., has not been summarized.*

b) *MPEP 1.192 (c)(7) states that "appellant [must] explain why the claims of the group are believed to be separately patentable", and that "[m]erely pointing out differences in what the claims cover is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable".*

*Gary L. Kunz*  
**GARY L. KUNZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**